Kalman filter in quantum language

Shiro Ishikawa, Kohshi Kikuchi

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology, Keio University, 3-14-1, Hiyoshi, Kouhoku-ku Yokohama, Japan. E-mail: ishikawa@math.keio.ac.jp,

Department of Applied Molecular Bioscience, Graduate School of Medicine, Yamaguchi University 2-16-1 Tokiwadai, Ube 755-8611, Japan, E-mail: kohshi.kikuchi@gmail.com

arXiv:1404.2664v1 [math.ST] 10 Apr 2014

Abstract
Recently, we proposed measurement theory (or. quantum language) as a linguistic turn of quantum mechanics (with the Copenhagen interpretation). This theory has a great power of scientific descriptions. In fact, we have continued asserting that even statistics can be described in terms of measurement theory. Thus, we believe that quantum language is future statistics (i.e., statistics will develop into quantum language). However, now we think that our arguments were too abstract and philosophical, that is, we should have presented concrete examples much more. Thus, in this paper, we show that the calculation of Kalman filter is more understandable in terms of quantum language than in terms of usual statistics. For this, we devote ourselves to statistical measurement theory, in which the Bertrand paradox is discussed.

Keywords: the Copenhagen Interpretation, Operator Algebra, Quantum and Classical Measurement Theory, Bayesian statistics, Bertrand paradox Kalman Filter.

1 Measurement Theory (Axioms and Interpretation)

1.1 The classifications of measurement theory

In this section, we introduce measurement theory (or in short, MT). This theory is a kind of language, and thus, it is also called quantum language (or in short, QL).

Measurement theory (*cf.* refs. [3]- [15]) is, by an analogy of quantum mechanics (or, as a linguistic turn of quantum mechanics), constructed as the scientific theory formulated in a certain C^*-algebra $\mathcal{A}$ (i.e., a norm closed subalgebra in the operator algebra $B(H)$ composed of all bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space H, *cf.* [18, 19]). Let $\mathcal{N}$ be the weak* closure of $\mathcal{A}$, which is called a W^*-algebra. The structure $[\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \subseteq B(H)]$ is called a fundamental structure of MT.

MT (= measurement theory) is composed of two theories (i.e., pure measurement theory (or, in short, PMT] and statistical measurement theory (or, in short, SMT). That is, we have:

$$(\mathrm{A}_1)\quad \mathrm{MT}\begin{cases} \text{[PMT](related to Fisher statistics)} = \underset{(\mathrm{Axiom}^{\mathrm{P}}\ 1)}{\text{[(pure) measurement]}} + \underset{(\mathrm{Axiom}\ 2)}{\text{[causality]}} \\ \\ \text{[SMT](related to Baysian statitics)} = \underset{(\mathrm{Axiom}^{\mathrm{S}}\ 1)}{\text{[(statistical) measurement]}} + \underset{(\mathrm{Axiom}\ 2)}{\text{[causality]}} \end{cases}$$

where Axiom 2 is common in PMT and SMT. For completeness, note that measurement theory (A_1) is a kind of language based on "the quantum mechanical world view", (*cf.* refs. [3, 7, 8]).

When $\mathcal{A} = B_c(H)$, the C^*-algebra composed of all compact operators on a Hilbert space H, the MT is called quantum measurement theory (or, quantum system theory), which can be regarded as the linguistic aspect of quantum mechanics. Also, when $\mathcal{A}$ is commutative (that is, when $\mathcal{A}$ is characterized by $C_0(\Omega)$, the C^*-algebra composed of all continuous complex-valued functions vanishing at infinity on a locally compact Hausdorff space Ω (*cf.* [19])), the MT is called classical measurement theory. Thus, we have the following classification:

$$(\mathrm{A}_2)\quad \mathrm{MT}\begin{cases} \text{quantum MT} \quad (\text{when non-commutative } \mathcal{A} = B_c(H),\ \mathcal{N} = B(H)) \\ \\ \text{classical MT} \quad (\text{when commutative } \mathcal{A} = C_0(\Omega)),\ \mathcal{N} = L^\infty(\Omega, \nu)(\subseteq B(L^2(\Omega, \nu))) \end{cases}$$

Also, MT has two formulations as follows.

$$(\mathrm{A}_3)\quad \mathrm{MT}\begin{cases} \mathrm{MT}^{C^*}(C^*\text{-algebraic formulation}); \text{ the } C^*\text{-algebra } \mathcal{A} \text{ plays an important role} \\ \\ \mathrm{MT}^{W^*}(W^*\text{-algebraic formulation}); \text{ the } W^*\text{-algebra } \mathcal{N} \text{ plays an important role} \end{cases}$$

In this paper, we devote ourselves to classical SMT^{W^*} (i.e., the classical statistical measurement theory with the W^*-algebra formulation).

1.2 Observables

Now we shall explain the measurement theory (i.e., classical SMT^{W^*}).

Let $[\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \subseteq B(H)]$ be the fundamental structure of measurement theory. Let $\mathcal{N}_*$ be the pre-dual Banach space of $\mathcal{N}$. That is, $\mathcal{N}_* = \{\rho \mid \rho \text{ is a weak}^* \text{ continuous linear functional on } \mathcal{N} \}$, and the norm $\|\rho\|_{\mathcal{N}_*}$ is defined by $\sup\{|\rho(F)| : F \in \mathcal{N} \text{ such that } \|F\|_{\mathcal{N}}(= \|F\|_{B(H)}) \leq 1\}$. The bi-linear functional $\rho(F)$ is also denoted by ${}_{\mathcal{N}_*}\langle \rho, F\rangle_{\mathcal{N}}$, or in short $\langle \rho, F\rangle$. Define the *mixed state* ρ $(\in \mathcal{N}_*)$ such that $\|\rho\|_{\mathcal{N}_*} = 1$ and $\rho(F) \geq 0$ for all $F \in \mathcal{N}$ satisfying $F \geq 0$. And put

$$\mathfrak{S}^m(\mathcal{N}_*)=\{\rho \in \mathcal{N}_* \mid \rho \text{ is a mixed state}\}.$$

According to the noted idea (*cf.* ref. [1]) in quantum mechanics, an *observable* $\mathsf{O} \equiv(X, \mathcal{F}, F)$ in the W^*-algebra $\mathcal{N}$ is defined as follows:

(B_1) [σ-field] X is a set, $\mathcal{F}(\subseteq 2^X$, the power set of $X)$ is a σ-field of X, that is, "$\Xi_1, \Xi_2, \Xi_3, \cdots \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow \cup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Xi_k \in \mathcal{F}$", "$X \in \mathcal{F}$" and "$\Xi \in \mathcal{F} \Rightarrow X \setminus \Xi \in \mathcal{F}$".

(B_2) [Countably additivity] F is a mapping from $\mathcal{F}$ to $\mathcal{N}$ satisfying: (a): for every $\Xi \in \mathcal{F}$, $F(\Xi)$ is a non-negative element in $\mathcal{N}$ such that $0 \leq F(\Xi) \leq I$, (b): $F(\emptyset) = 0$ and $F(X) = I$, where 0 and I is the 0-element and the identity in $\mathcal{N}$ respectively. (c): for any countable decomposition $\{\Xi_1, \Xi_2, \ldots\}$ of Ξ $\in \mathcal{F}$ (i.e., $\Xi_k, \Xi \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $\bigcup_{k=1}^{\infty} \Xi_k = \Xi$, $\Xi_i \cap \Xi_j = \emptyset (i \neq j)$), it holds that

$$\lim_{K\to\infty} {}_{\mathcal{N}_*}\langle \rho, F(\bigcup_{k=1}^{K} \Xi_k)\rangle_{\mathcal{N}} = {}_{\mathcal{N}_*}\langle \rho, F(\Xi)\rangle_{\mathcal{N}} \quad (\forall \rho \in \mathfrak{S}^m(\mathcal{N}_*)) \tag{1}$$

i.e., $\lim_{K\to\infty} F(\bigcup_{k=1}^{K} \Xi_k) = F(\Xi)$ in the sense of weak* convergence in $\mathcal{N}$.

1.3 Pure Measurement Theory

Our concern in this paper is SMT in (A_1), which is constructed on the base of PMT. Thus, we begin with PMT.

With any *system* S, a fundamental structure $[\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \subseteq B(H)]$ can be associated in which the pure measurement theory (A_1) of that system can be formulated. A *pure state* of the system S is represented by an element $\rho^p(\in \mathfrak{S}^p(\mathcal{A}^*)=$"pure state class"(*cf.* ref. [7])) and an *observable* is represented by an observable $\mathsf{O} =(X, \mathcal{F}, F)$ in $\mathcal{N}$. Also, the *measurement of the observable* O *for the system* S *with the pure state* ρ^p is denoted by $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}, S_{[\rho^p]})$ (or more precisely, $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O} =(X, \mathcal{F}, F), S_{[\rho^p]})$). An observer can obtain a measured value x $(\in X)$ by the measurement $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}, S_{[\rho^p]})$.

The $\mathrm{Axiom}^{\mathrm{P}}$ 1 presented below is a kind of mathematical generalization of Born's probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics.

$\mathrm{Axiom}^{\mathrm{P}}$ 1 [Pure Measurement]. *The probability that a measured value* x $(\in X)$ *obtained by the measurement* $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O} \equiv(X, \mathcal{F}, F), S_{[\rho_0^p]})$ *belongs to a set* $\Xi(\in \mathcal{F})$ *is given by* $\rho_0^p(F(\Xi))$, *if* $F(\Xi)$ *is essentially continuous at* ρ_0^p *(cf. ref. [7]).*

Next, we explain Axiom 2 in (A_1). Let $(T, \leq)$ be a tree, i.e., a partial ordered set such that "$t_1 \leq t_3$ and $t_2 \leq t_3$" implies "$t_1 \leq t_2$ or $t_2 \leq t_1$". In this paper, we assume that T is finite. Assume that there exists an element $t_0 \in T$, called the *root* of T, such that $t_0 \leq t$ $(\forall t \in T)$ holds. Put $T^2_{\leq} = \{(t_1, t_2) \in T^2 \mid t_1 \leq t_2\}$. The family $\{\Phi_{t_1,t_2} : \mathcal{N}_{t_2} \to \mathcal{N}_{t_1}\}_{(t_1,t_2)\in T^2_{\leq}}$ is called a *causal relation* (*due to the Heisenberg picture*), if it satisfies the following conditions (C_1) and (C_2).

(C_1) With each $t \in T$, a fundamental structure $[\mathcal{A}_t \subseteq \mathcal{N}_t \subseteq B(H_t)]$ is associated.

(C_2) For every $(t_1, t_2) \in T^2_{\leq}$, a continuous Markov operator $\Phi^{t_1,t_2} : \mathcal{N}_{t_2}$(with the weak* topology) $\to \mathcal{N}_{t_1}$ (with the weak* topology) is defined (i.e., $\Phi^{t_1,t_2} \geq 0$, $\Phi^{t_1,t_2}(I_{\mathcal{N}_{t_2}}) = I_{\mathcal{N}_{t_1}}$). And it satisfies that $\Phi^{t_1,t_2}\Phi^{t_2,t_3} = \Phi^{t_1,t_3}$ holds for any (t_1, t_2), $(t_2, t_3) \in T^2_{\leq}$.

The family of pre-dual operators $\{\Phi^{t_1,t_2}_* : \mathfrak{S}^m((\mathcal{N}_{t_1})_*) \to \mathfrak{S}^m((\mathcal{N}_{t_2})_*)\}_{(t_1,t_2)\in T^2_{\leq}}$ is called a *pre-dual causal relation* (*due to the Schrödinger picture*).

Now Axiom 2 in the measurement theory (A_1) is presented as follows:

Axiom 2 [Causality]. *The causality is represented by a causal relation* $\{\Phi^{t_1,t_2} : \mathcal{N}_{t_2} \to \mathcal{N}_{t_1}\}_{(t_1,t_2)\in T^2_{\leq}}$.

1.4 Linguistic Interpretation

Next, we have to study the linguistic interpretation (i.e., the manual of "how to use the above axioms") as follows. That is, we present the following interpretation (D) [=(D_1), (D_2)], which is characterized as a kind of linguistic turn of so-called Copenhagen interpretation (*cf.* refs. [7, 8]). That is,

(D_1) Consider the dualism composed of "observer" and "system(=measuring object)". And therefore, "observer" and "system" must be absolutely separated.

(D_2) Only one measurement is permitted. And thus, the state after a measurement is meaningless since it can not be measured any longer. Also, the causality should be assumed only in the side of system, however, a state never moves. Thus, the Heisenberg picture should be adopted. And thus, the Schrödinger picture is rather makeshift.

and so on.

The following argument is a consequence of the above (D_2). For each $k = 1, 2, \ldots, K$, consider a measurement $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}_k \equiv (X_k, \mathcal{F}_k, F_k), S_{[\rho]})$. However, since the ($D_2$) says that only one measurement is permitted, the measurements $\{\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}_k, S_{[\rho]})\}_{k=1}^K$ should be reconsidered in what follows. Under the commutativity condition such that

$$\begin{aligned} F_i(\Xi_i)F_j(\Xi_j) = F_j(\Xi_j)F_i(\Xi_i) \\ (\forall \Xi_i \in \mathcal{F}_i, \forall \Xi_j \in \mathcal{F}_j, i \neq j), \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

we can define the product observable $\times_{k=1}^K \mathsf{O}_k = (\times_{k=1}^K X_k, \boxtimes_{k=1}^K \mathcal{F}_k, \times_{k=1}^K F_k)$ in $\mathcal{N}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} (\times_{k=1}^K F_k)(\times_{k=1}^K \Xi_k) = F_1(\Xi_1)F_2(\Xi_2)\cdots F_K(\Xi_K) \\ (\forall \Xi_k \in \mathcal{F}_k, \forall k = 1, \ldots, K). \end{aligned}$$

Here, $\boxtimes_{k=1}^K \mathcal{F}_k$ is the smallest σ-field including the family $\{\times_{k=1}^K \Xi_k : \Xi_k \in \mathcal{F}_k \ k = 1, 2, \ldots, K\}$. Then, the above $\{\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}_k, S_{[\rho]})\}_{k=1}^K$ is, under the commutativity condition (2), represented by the simultaneous measurement $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\times_{k=1}^K \mathsf{O}_k, S_{[\rho]})$.

Consider a tree $(T \equiv \{t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_n\}, \leq)$ with the root t_0. This is also characterized by the map $\pi : T \setminus \{t_0\} \to T$ such that $\pi(t) = \max\{s \in T \mid s < t\}$. Let $\{\Phi^{t,t'} : \mathcal{N}_{t'} \to \mathcal{N}_t\}_{(t,t')\in T^2_{\leq}}$ be a causal relation, which is also represented by $\{\Phi_{\pi(t),t} : \mathcal{N}_t \to \mathcal{N}_{\pi(t)}\}_{t\in T\setminus\{t_0\}}$. Let an observable $\mathsf{O}_t \equiv (X_t, \mathcal{F}_t, F_t)$ in the $\mathcal{N}_t$ be given for each $t \in T$. Note that $\Phi_{\pi(t),t}\mathsf{O}_t$ ($\equiv (X_t, \mathcal{F}_t, \Phi_{\pi(t),t}F_t)$) is an observable in the $\mathcal{N}_{\pi(t)}$.

The pair $[\mathbb{O}_T] = [\{\mathsf{O}_t\}_{t\in T}, \{\Phi^{t,t'} : \mathcal{N}_{t'} \to \mathcal{N}_t\}_{(t,t')\in T^2_{\leq}}]$ is called a *sequential causal observable*. For each $s \in T$, put $T_s = \{t \in T \mid t \geq s\}$. And define the observable $\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_s \equiv (\times_{t\in T_s} X_t, \boxtimes_{t\in T_s} \mathcal{F}_t, \widehat{F}_s)$ in $\mathcal{N}_s$ as follows:

$$\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_s = \begin{cases} \mathsf{O}_s & (\text{if } s \in T \setminus \pi(T)\ ) \\ \mathsf{O}_s \times (\ \times_{t\in\pi^{-1}(\{s\})} \Phi_{\pi(t),t}\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_t) & (\text{if } s \in \pi(T)) \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

if the commutativity condition holds (i.e., if the product observable $\mathsf{O}_s \times (\ \times_{t\in\pi^{-1}(\{s\})} \Phi_{\pi(t),t}\ \widehat{\mathsf{O}}_t)$ exists) for each $s \in \pi(T)$. Using (3) iteratively, we can finally obtain the observable $\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_{t_0}$ in $\mathcal{N}_{t_0}$. The $\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_{t_0}$ is called the realization (or, realized causal observable) of $[\mathbb{O}_T]$.

1.5 Statistical Measurement Theory

Let $[\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \subseteq B(H)]$ be a fundamental structure. We shall introduce the following notation: It is usual to consider that we do not know the pure state ρ_0^p $(\in \mathfrak{S}^p(\mathcal{A}^*))$ when we take a measurement $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}, S_{[\rho_0^p]})$. That is because we usually take a measurement $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}, S_{[\rho_0^p]})$ in order to know the state ρ_0^p. Thus, when we want to emphasize that we do not know the state ρ_0^p, $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}, S_{[\rho_0^p]})$ is denoted by $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}, S_{[*]})$. Also, when we know the distribution ρ_0^m $(\in \mathfrak{S}^m(\mathcal{N}_*))$ of the unknown state ρ_0^p, the $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}, S_{[\rho_0^p]})$ is denoted by $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O}, S_{[*]}(\rho_0^m))$. The ρ_0^m is called a mixed state. In Bayesian statistics, the mixed state ρ_0^m may be called a "subjective pretest state" (*cf.* refs. [7]– [10]).

The Axiom$^{\mathrm{S}}$ 1 presented below is also a kind of mathematical generalization of Born's probabilistic interpretation of quantum mechanics.

Axiom$^{\mathrm{S}}$ 1 [Statistical measurement]. *The probability that a measured value* x $(\in X)$ *obtained by the measurement* $\mathsf{M}_{\mathcal{N}}(\mathsf{O} \equiv (X, \mathcal{F}, F), S_{[*]}(\rho_0^m))$ *belongs to a set* $\Xi (\in \mathcal{F})$ *is given by* $\rho_0^m(F(\Xi))$ $(= {}_{\mathcal{N}_*}\langle \rho_0^m, F(\Xi)\rangle_{\mathcal{N}}$).

1.6 Examples of SMT (Bertrand paradox)

Consider classical systems in a commutative W^*-algebra $L^\infty(\Omega, m)$. We can define the exact observable $\mathsf{O}_E = (\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\Omega, F_E)$ in $L^\infty(\Omega, m)$ such that

$$[F_E(\Xi)](\omega) = \chi_\Xi(\omega) = \begin{cases} 1 & (\omega \in \Xi) \\ 0 & (\omega \notin \Xi) \end{cases} \qquad (\forall \omega \in \Omega, \ \ \Xi \in \mathcal{B}_\Omega)$$

Here, we have the following problem:

(E_1) Can the measurement $\mathsf{M}_{L^\infty(\Omega,m)}(\mathsf{O}_E, S_{[*]}(\rho))$ that represents "at random" be determined uniquely?

This question is of course denied by so-called Bertrand paradox. Here, let us review the argument about the Bertrand paradox (*cf.* [2, 6]). Consider the following problem:

(E_2) Given a circle with the radius 1. Suppose a chord of the circle is chosen at random. What is the probability that the chord is shorter than $\sqrt{3}$?

This problem is not well-posed. That is because this (E_2) is essentially the same as the following problem (E_3):

(Fig.0)

(E_3) In Fig. 0, does there exist the most natural coordinate by which a chord l is represented? Or, is the most natural coordinate determined uniquely?

This is of course denied as follows.

(Fig.1)



(Fig.2)



[The first answer (Fig.1)]. In Fig.1, we see that the chord l is represented by a point (α, β) in the rectangle $\Omega_1 \equiv \{(\alpha, \beta) \mid 0 < \alpha \leq 2\pi,\ 0 < \beta \leq \pi/2(\text{radian})\}$. That is, we have the following identification:

$$\Omega(= \text{the set of all chords}) \ni l_{(\alpha,\beta)} \approx (\alpha, \beta) \in \Omega_1 (\subset \mathbb{R}^2).$$

Under the identification, we get the natural probability measure m_1 on Ω_1 such that $m_1(A) = \frac{\text{Meas}[A]}{\text{Meas}[\Omega_1]} = \frac{\text{Meas}[A]}{\pi^2}$ $(\forall A \in \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_1})$, where " Meas" = " Lebesgue measure" Therefore, we have a natural measurement $\mathsf{M}_{L^\infty(\Omega_1, m_1)}(\mathsf{O}_E \equiv (\Omega_1, \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_1}, F_E), S_{[*]}(1))$. Put

$$\Xi^1_{\sqrt{3}} = \{(\alpha, \beta) \in \Omega_1 \ :\ \text{"the length of } l_{(\alpha,\beta)}\text{"} < \sqrt{3}\}$$

Then, Axiom$^{\text{S}}$ 1 says that the probability that a measured value (α, β) belongs to $\Xi^1_{\sqrt{3}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_1} [F_E(\Xi^1_{\sqrt{3}})](\omega_1)\ m_1(d\omega_1) = \int_{\Xi^1_{\sqrt{3}}} 1\ \ m_1(d\omega_1) \\
=&m_1(\{l_{(\alpha,\beta)} \approx (\alpha, \beta) \in \Omega_1 \mid \text{"the length of } l_{(\alpha,\beta)}\text{"} \leq \sqrt{3}\}) \\
=&\frac{\text{Meas}[\{(\alpha, \beta) \mid 0 \leq \alpha \leq 2\pi,\ \pi/6 \leq \beta \leq \pi/2\}]}{\text{Meas}[\{(\alpha, \beta) \mid 0 \leq \alpha \leq 2\pi,\ 0 \leq \beta \leq \pi/2\}]} \\
=&\frac{2\pi \times (\pi/3)}{\pi^2} = \frac{2}{3}.
\end{aligned}$$

[The second answer (Fig.2)]. In Fig.2, we see that the chord l is represented by a point (x, y) in the circle $\Omega_2 \equiv \{(x, y) \mid x^2 + y^2 < 1\}$. That is, we have the following identification:

$$\Omega(= \text{the set of all chords}) \ni l_{(x,y)} \approx (x, y) \in \Omega_2 (\subset \mathbb{R}^2).$$

Under the identification, we get the natural probability measure m_2 on Ω_2 such that $m_2(A) = \frac{\text{Meas}[A]}{\text{Meas}[\Omega_2]} = \frac{\text{Meas}[A]}{\pi}$ $(\forall A \in \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_2})$. Therefore, we have a natural measurement $\mathsf{M}_{L^\infty(\Omega_2, m_2)}(\mathsf{O}_E \equiv (\Omega_2, \mathcal{B}_{\Omega_2}, F_E), S_{[*]}(1))$. Put

$$\Xi^2_{\sqrt{3}} = \{(x, y) \in \Omega_2 \ :\ \text{"the length of } l_{(x,y)}\text{"} < \sqrt{3}\}$$

Then, Axiom$^{\text{S}}$ 1 says that the probability that a measured value (x, y) belongs to $\Xi^2_{\sqrt{3}}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_2} [F_E(\Xi^2_{\sqrt{3}})](\omega_2)\ m_2(d\omega_2) = \int_{\Xi^2_{\sqrt{3}}} 1\ \ m_2(d\omega_2) \\
=&m_2(\{l_{(x,y)} \approx (x, y) \in \Omega_2 \mid \text{"the length of } l_{(x,y)}\text{"} \leq \sqrt{3}\}) \\
=&\frac{\text{Meas}[\{(x, y) \mid 1/4 \leq x^2 + y^2 \leq 1\}]}{\pi} = \frac{3}{4}.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the first answer and the second answer say that the question (E_1) is denied. Also note that this is not a paradox since quantum language is a language. And thus, it is certain that, for each $i = 1, 2$, there exist some phenomena such that they are represented by the measurement $\mathsf{M}_{L^\infty(\Omega_i, m_i)}(\mathsf{O}_E, S_{[*]}(1))$. However, it should be noted that, if the state space Ω is finite, the concept of "at random" (or, "having no information") is meaningful in the sense of ref. [10].

2 Bayes Method in classical $L^\infty(\Omega, m)$

2.1 Notations

As mentioned in the previous section, in this paper, we devote ourselves to

$$\boxed{\mathrm{SMT}^{W^*}} = \overset{\text{measurement}}{\boxed{\mathrm{Axiom}^{\mathrm{S}}\ 1}} + \overset{\text{causality}}{\boxed{\mathrm{Axiom}\ 2}} + \overset{\text{interpretation(= how to use axioms)}}{\boxed{\text{Linguistic Interpretation}}}$$

in classical sysytems. Thus, the fundamental structure $[\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathcal{N} \subseteq B(H)]$ is represented by

$$[C_0(\Omega) \subseteq L^\infty(\Omega, m) \subseteq B(L^2(\Omega, m))]$$

where the measure space $(\Omega, \mathcal{B}_\Omega, m)$ is assumed to satisfy that

$$m(\{\omega\}) = 0 \ \ (\forall \omega \in \Omega), \qquad m(D) > 0 \ \ (\forall \text{open set } D (\subseteq \Omega\text{: locally compact space}))$$

also, the Borel σ-field $\mathcal{B}_\Omega$ is defined as the smallest σ-field including all open sets in Ω. It should be noted that the dual Banach space of $L^1(\Omega)$ (i.e., the space composed of all integral functions on Ω) is equal to $L^\infty(\Omega)$, that is, $L^\infty(\Omega)_* = L^1(\Omega)$. Therefore, the bi-linear functional $\rho(f)$ is represented by

$$\rho(f) = {}_{L^1(\Omega)}\langle \rho, F \rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega)} = \int_\Omega f(\omega)\rho(\omega) m(d\omega)$$
$$(\forall f \in L^\infty(\Omega, m)(\text{or, in short } L^\infty(\Omega)), \ \ \rho \in L^1(\Omega, m)(\text{or, in short } L^1(\Omega)))$$

(*cf.* [20]). Also, note that the mixed state space $\mathfrak{S}^m(\mathcal{N}_*)$ is characterized such as

$$\mathfrak{S}^m(\mathcal{N}_*) = L^1_{+1}(\Omega) \equiv \{\rho \in L^1(\Omega) \ : \ \rho \geq 0, \ \ ||\rho||_{L^1(\Omega)} \equiv \int_\Omega |\rho(\omega)| m(d\omega) = 1\}.$$

2.2 Bayes Method in Classical $L^\infty(\Omega, m)$

Let $\mathsf{O} \equiv (X, \mathcal{F}, F)$ be an observable in a commutative W^*-algebra $L^\infty(\Omega, m)$. And let $\mathsf{O}' \equiv (Y, \mathcal{G}, G)$ be any observable in $L^\infty(\Omega, m)$. Consider the product observable $\mathsf{O} \times \mathsf{O}' \equiv (X \times Y, \mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{G}, F \times G)$ in $L^\infty(\Omega, m)$.

Assume that we know that the measured value (x, y) obtained by a simultaneous measurement $\mathsf{M}_{L^\infty(\Omega, m)}(\mathsf{O} \times \mathsf{O}', S_{[*]}(\rho_0))$ belongs to $\Xi \times Y$ $(\in \mathcal{F} \boxtimes \mathcal{G})$. Then, by $\mathrm{Axiom}^{\mathrm{S}}$ 1, we say that

(F_1) the probability $P_\Xi(G(\Gamma))$ that y belongs to $\Gamma (\in \mathcal{G})$ is given by

$$P_\Xi(G(\Gamma)) = \frac{\int_\Omega [F(\Xi) \cdot G(\Gamma)](\omega)\ \rho_0(\omega)\ m(d\omega)}{\int_\Omega [F(\Xi)](\omega)\ \rho_0(\omega)\ m(d\omega)} \ \ (\forall \Gamma \in \mathcal{G}).$$

Thus, we can assert that:

(F_2) When we know that a measured value obtained by a measurement $\mathsf{M}_{L^\infty(\Omega, m)}(\mathsf{O} \equiv (X, \mathcal{F}, F), S_{[*]}(\rho_0))$ belongs to Ξ, there is a reason to infer that the mixed state after the measurement is equal to ρ_0^a $(\in L^1_{+1}(\Omega))$, where

$$\rho_0^a(\omega) = \frac{[F(\Xi)](\omega)\ \rho_0(\omega)}{\int_\Omega [F(\Xi)](\omega)\ \rho_0(\omega)\ m(d\omega)} \quad (\forall \omega \in \Omega).$$

After all, we can define the Bayes operator $[B^0_{\mathsf{O}}(\Xi)] : L^1_{+1}(\Omega) \to L^1_{+1}(\Omega)$ such that

$$(\mathrm{F}_3)\qquad \overset{\text{(pretest state)}}{\underset{(\in L^1_{+1}(\Omega))}{\boxed{\rho_0}}} \xrightarrow[\text{Bayes operator}]{[B^0_{\mathsf{O}}(\Xi)]} \overset{\text{(posttest state)}}{\underset{(\in L^1_{+1}(\Omega))}{\boxed{\rho^a_0}}}$$

Remark 1. The above (F_2) superficially contradicts the linguistic interpretation (D_2), which says that "a state never move". In this sense, the above (F_2) is convenient and makeshift. For the precise argument, see [7, 8]. That is, in spite of the linguistic interpretation (D_2), we admit the wavefunction collapse such as (F_2).

2.3 Bayes-Kalman Method in Classical $L^\infty(\Omega, m)$

Let t_0 be the root of a tree T. Let $[\mathbb{O}_T] = [\{\mathsf{O}_t(\equiv (X_t, \mathcal{F}_t, F_t))\}_{t\in T}, \{\Phi^{t_1,t_2} : L^\infty(\Omega_{t_2}) \to L^\infty(\Omega_{t_1})\}_{(t_1,t_2)\in T^2_\leq}]$ be a sequential causal observable with the realization $\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_{t_0} \equiv (\times_{t\in T} X_t,\ \boxtimes_{t\in T}\mathcal{G}_t,\ \widehat{F}_{t_0})$ in $L^\infty(\Omega_{t_0})$. And let $[\mathbb{O}^\times_T] = [\{\mathsf{O}^\times_t(\equiv (X_t \times Y_t,\ \mathcal{F}_t \boxtimes \mathcal{G}_t, F_t \times G_t))\}_{t\in T}, \{\Phi^{t_1,t_2} : L^\infty(\Omega_{t_2}) \to L^\infty(\Omega_{t_1})\}_{(t_1,t_2)\in T^2_\leq}]$ be a sequential causal observable with the realization $\widehat{\mathsf{O}}^\times_{t_0} \equiv (\times_{t\in T}(X_t \times Y_t),\ \boxtimes_{t\in T}(\mathcal{F}_t \boxtimes \mathcal{G}_t),\ \widehat{H}_{t_0})$ in $L^\infty(\Omega_{t_0})$. Thus we have the statistical measurement $\mathsf{M}_{C(\Omega_{t_0})}(\widehat{\mathsf{O}}^\times_{t_0}, S_{[*]}(\rho_0))$, where $\rho_0 \in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_{t_0})$. Assume that we know that the measured value (x, y) $(= ((x_t)_{t\in T}, (y_t)_{t\in T},) \in (\times_{t\in T} X_t) \times (\times_{t\in T} Y_t))$ obtained by the measurement $\mathsf{M}_{C(\Omega_{t_0})}(\widehat{\mathsf{O}}^\times_{t_0}, S_{[*]}(\rho_0))$ belongs to $(\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t) \times (\times_{t\in T} Y_t)$ $(\in (\boxtimes_{t\in T}\mathcal{F}_t) \boxtimes (\boxtimes_{t\in T}\mathcal{G}_t))$. Then, by Axiom$^{\mathrm{S}}$ 1, we can infer that

(G_1) the probability $P_{\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t}((G_t(\Gamma_t))_{t\in T})$ that y belongs to $\times_{t\in T}\Gamma_t (\in \boxtimes_{t\in T}\mathcal{G}_t)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t}((G_t(\Gamma_t))_{t\in T}) \\ =&\frac{\int_{\Omega_0}[\widehat{H}_{t_0}((\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t) \times (\times_{t\in T}\Gamma_t))](\omega_0)\ \rho_0(\omega_0)\ m_0(d\omega_0)}{\int_{\Omega_0}[\widehat{H}_{t_0}(\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t) \times (\times_{t\in T} Y_t)](\omega_0)\ \rho_0(\omega_0)\ m_0(d\omega_0)} \\ &(\forall \Gamma_t \in \mathcal{G}_t, t \in T). \end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

Let $s \in T$ be fixed. Assume that

$$\Gamma_t = Y_t \quad (\forall t \in T \text{ such that } t \neq s)$$

Thus, putting $\widehat{P}_{\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t}(G_s(\Gamma_s)) = P_{\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t}((G_t(\Gamma_t))_{t\in T})$, we see that $\widehat{P}_{\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t} \in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_s, m_s)$. That is, there uniquely exists $\rho^a_s \in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_s, m_s)$ such that

$$\widehat{P}_{\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t}((G_s(\Gamma_s)) = {}_{L^1(\Omega_s)}\langle \rho^a_s, G_s(\Gamma_s)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_s)} = \int_{\Omega_s}[G_s(\Gamma_s)](\omega_s)\rho^a_s(\omega_s)m_s(d\omega_s) \tag{5}$$

for any observable $(Y_s, \mathcal{G}_s, G_s)$ in $L^\infty(\Omega_s)$. That is because the linear functional $\widehat{P}_{\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t} : L^\infty(\Omega_s) \to \mathbb{C}$ (complex numbers) is weak* continuous. After all, we can define the Bayes-Kalman operator $[B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_{t_0}}(\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t)] : L^1_{+1}(\Omega_{t_0}) \to L^1_{+1}(\Omega_s)$ such that

$$(\mathrm{G}_2)\qquad \overset{\text{(pretest state)}}{\underset{(\in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_{t_0}))}{\boxed{\rho_0}}} \xrightarrow[\text{Bayes-Kalman operator}]{[B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_{t_0}}(\times_{t\in T}\Xi_t)]} \overset{\text{(posttest state)}}{\underset{(\in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_s))}{\boxed{\rho^a_0}}}$$

which is the generalization of the (F_3) (*cf.* [5, 15, 16]). Here, the ref. [16] is of course great. However, now we think that our arguments in refs. [6, 15] were too abstract and philosophical, that is, we should have presented concrete examples much more. This will be done in the following sections.

3 A simle example of Kalman filter

3.1 The computable situation

Put $T = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, and define the parents map $\pi : T \setminus \{0\} \to T$ such that $\pi(k) = k - 1$. For each $k \in T$, define the commutative W^*-algebra:

$$\mathcal{N}_k = L^\infty(\Omega_k, m_k) = L^\infty(\mathbb{R}, d\omega) \quad (\text{where } d\omega \text{ is the usual Lebesgue measure on } \mathbb{R})$$

and thus, the pre-dual Banach space $(\mathcal{N}_k)_*$ is defined as follows.

$$(\mathcal{N}_k)_* = L^1(\Omega_k, m_k) = L^1(\mathbb{R}.d\omega) \quad (k \in T = \{0, 1, 2, \cdots, n\})$$

Consider the sequential observable $[\mathbb{O}_T] = [\{\mathsf{O}_t\}_{t\in T}, \{\Phi^{t-1,t} : \mathcal{N}_t \to \mathcal{N}_{t-1}\}_{T=1,2,\cdots,n}]$, and assume the initial state $\rho_0 \in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_0, m_0)$.
Thus, we have the following situation:

$$\underset{\mathsf{O}_0=(X_0,\mathcal{F}_0F_0)}{\boxed{L^\infty(\Omega_0, m_0)}} \xleftarrow{\Phi^{0,1}} \underset{\mathsf{O}_1=(X_1,\mathcal{F}_1F_1)}{\boxed{L^\infty(\Omega_1, m_1)}} \xleftarrow{\Phi^{1,2}} \cdots \xleftarrow{\Phi^{s-1,s}} \underset{\mathsf{O}_s=(X_s,\mathcal{F}_sF_s)}{\boxed{L^\infty(\Omega_s, m_s)}} \xleftarrow{\Phi^{s,s+1}} \cdots \xleftarrow{\Phi^{n-1,n}} \underset{\mathsf{O}_n=(X_n,\mathcal{F}_nF_n)}{\boxed{L^\infty(\Omega_n, m_n)}}$$

(initial state ρ_0)

or, equivalently,

$$\underset{\mathsf{O}_0=(X_0,\mathcal{F}_0,F_0)}{\boxed{L^1(\Omega_0, m_0)}} \xrightarrow{\Phi^{0,1}_*} \underset{\mathsf{O}_1=(X_1,\mathcal{F}_1,F_1)}{\boxed{L^1(\Omega_1, m_1)}} \xrightarrow{\Phi^{1,2}_*} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Phi^{s-1,s}_*} \underset{\mathsf{O}_s=(X_s,\mathcal{F}_s,F_s)}{\boxed{L^1(\Omega_s, m_s)}} \xrightarrow{\Phi^{s,s+1}_*} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Phi^{n-1,n}_*} \underset{\mathsf{O}_n=(X_n,\mathcal{F}_n,F_n)}{\boxed{L^1(\Omega_n, m_n)}}$$

(initial state ρ_0)

Here the initial state $\rho_0 (\in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_0, m_0))$ is defined by

$$\rho_0(\omega_0) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_0} \exp[-\frac{(\omega_0 - \mu_0)^2}{2\sigma_0^2}] \qquad (\forall \omega_0 \in \Omega_0) \tag{6}$$

where it is assumed that μ_0 and σ_0 are known.

Also, for each $t \in T = \{0, 1, \cdots, n\}$, consider the observable $\mathsf{O}_t = (X_t, \mathcal{F}_t, F_t) = (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}_\mathbb{R}, F_t)$ in $L^\infty(\Omega_t, m_t)$ such that

$$[F_t(\Xi_t)](\omega_t) = \int_{\Xi_t} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}q_t} \exp[-\frac{(x_t - c_t\omega_t - d_t)^2}{2q_t^2}]dx_t \equiv \int_{\Xi_t} f_{x_t}(\omega_t)dx_t \quad (\forall \Xi_t \in \mathcal{F}_t, \ \ \forall \omega_t \in \Omega_t) \tag{7}$$

where it is assumed that c_t, d_t and q_t are known $(t \in T)$.

And further, the causal operator $\Phi^{t-1.t} : L^\infty(\Omega_t) \to L^\infty(\Omega_{t-1})$ is defined by

$$[\Phi^{t-1,t}\widetilde{f}_{x_t}](\omega_{t-1}) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}r_t} \exp[-\frac{(\omega_t - a_t\omega_{t-1} - b_t)^2}{2r_t^2}]\widetilde{f}_{x_t})d\omega_t \equiv f_{t-1}(\omega_{t-1}) \tag{8}$$
$$(\forall \widetilde{f}_{x_t} \in L^\infty(\Omega_t, m_t), \ \ \forall \omega_{t-1} \in \Omega_{t-1})$$

where it is assumed that a_t, b_t and r_t are known $(t \in T)$.
Or, equivalently, the pre-dual causal operator $\Phi_*^{t-1.t} : L^1_{+1}(\Omega_{t-1}) \to L^1_{+1}(\Omega_t)$ is defined by

$$[\Phi_*^{t-1,t}\widetilde{\rho}_{t-1}](\omega_t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}r_t} \exp[-\frac{(\omega_t - a_t\omega_{t-1} - b_t)^2}{2r_t^2}]\widetilde{\rho}_{t-1}(\omega_{t-1})d\omega_{t-1} \tag{9}$$
$$(\forall \widetilde{\rho}_{t-1} \in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_{t-1}, m_{t-1}), \ \forall \omega_t \in \Omega_t)$$

Now we have the sequential observable $[\mathbb{O}_T] = [\{\mathsf{O}_t\}_{t\in T}, \{\Phi^{t-1,t} : \mathcal{N}_t \to \mathcal{N}_{t-1}\}_{T=1,2,\cdots,n}$. Let $\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_0$ $(\times_{t=0}^n X_t, \boxtimes_{t=0}^n \mathcal{F}_t, \widehat{F})$ be its realization. Then we have the following problem:

(H) Assume that a measured value $(x_0, x_2, \cdots, x_n)$ $(\in \times_{t=0}^n X_t)$ is obtained by the measurement $\mathsf{M}_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}$ $(\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_0, S_{[*]}(\rho_0))$. Let $s(\in T)$ be fixed. Then, calculate the Bayes-Kalman operator $[B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_0}(\times_{t\in T}\{x_t\})](\rho_0)$ in (G_2), where

$$[B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_0}(\underset{t\in T}{\times}\{x_t\})](\rho_0) = \lim_{\Xi_t \to x_t \ (t\in T)} [B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_0}(\underset{t\in T}{\times}\Xi_t)](\rho_0)$$

3.2 Bayes-Kalman operator $[B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_0}(\times_{t\in T}\{x_t\})] : L^1_{+1}(\Omega_s) \to L^1_{+1}(\Omega_n)$

In what follows, we solve the problem (H). For this, it suffices to find the $\rho_s \in L^1_{+1}(\Omega_s)$ such that

$$\lim_{\Xi_t\to x_t \ (t\in T)} \frac{\int_{\Omega_0}[\widehat{F}_0((\times^n_{t=0}\Xi_t)\times\Gamma_s)](\omega_0)\ \ \rho_0(\omega_0)d\omega_0}{\int_{\Omega_0}[\widehat{F}_0(\times^n_{t=0}\Xi_t)](\omega_0)\ \ \rho_0(\omega_0)d\omega_0} = \int_{\Omega_s}[G_s(\Gamma_s)](\omega_s)\ \ \rho_s(\omega_s)d\omega_s \quad (\forall\Gamma_s\in\mathcal{F}_s)$$

Let us calculate $\rho_s = [B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_0}(\times_{t\in T}\{x_t\})](\rho_0)$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\Omega_0}[\widehat{F}_0((\mathop{\times}_{t=0}^{n}\Xi_t)\times\Gamma_s)](\omega_0)\ \ \rho_0(\omega_0)d\omega_0\\
&=_{L^1(\Omega_0)}\langle\rho_0,\widehat{F}_0((\mathop{\times}_{t=0}^{n}\Xi_t)\times\Gamma_s)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}\\
&=_{L^1(\Omega_1)}\langle\Phi^{0,1}_*(F_0(\Xi_0)\rho_0),\widehat{F}_1((\mathop{\times}_{t=1}^{n}\Xi_t)\times\Gamma_s)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)} \qquad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

(I) and, putting $\widetilde{\rho}_0 = F_0(\Xi_0)\rho_0$ (or, exactly, its normalization, i.e., $\widetilde{\rho}_0 = \lim_{\Xi_0\to x_0}\frac{F_0(\Xi_0)\rho_0}{\int_{\Omega_0}F_0(\Xi_0)\rho_0 d\omega_0}$) , $\widetilde{\rho}_1 = F_1(\Xi_1)\Phi^{0,1}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_0)$, $\widetilde{\rho}_2 = F_2(\Xi_2)\Phi^{1,2}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_1)$, $\cdots$, $\widetilde{\rho}_{s-1} = F_{s-1}(\Xi_{s-1})\Phi^{s-2,s-1}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_{s-2})$, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}
(10) &=_{L^1(\Omega_1)}\langle\Phi^{0,1}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_0),\widehat{F}_1((\mathop{\times}_{t=1}^{n}\Xi_t)\times\Gamma_s)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_1)}\\
&=_{L^1(\Omega_2)}\langle\Phi^{1,2}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_1),\widehat{F}_2((\mathop{\times}_{t=2}^{n}\Xi_t)\times\Gamma_s)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_2)}\\
&\quad\cdots\cdots\\
&=_{L^1(\Omega_{s+1})}\langle\Phi^{s,s+1}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_s),\widehat{F}_{s+1}((\mathop{\times}_{t=s+1}^{n}\Xi_t)\times\Gamma_s)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_{s+1})}\\
&=_{L^1(\Omega_s)}\langle\Phi^{s-1,s}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_{s-1}),\widehat{F}_s((\mathop{\times}_{t=s}^{n}\Xi_t)\times\Gamma_s)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_s)}\\
&=_{L^1(\Omega_s)}\langle\Phi^{s-1,s}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_{s-1}),F_s(\Xi_s)G_s(\Gamma_s)\Phi^{s,s+1}\widehat{F}_{s+1}(\mathop{\times}_{t=s+1}^{n}\Xi_t)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_s)}\\
&=_{L^1(\Omega_s)}\langle\Big(F_s(\Xi_s)\Phi^{s,s+1}\widehat{F}_{s+1}(\mathop{\times}_{t=s+1}^{n}\Xi_t)\Big)\Big(\Phi^{s-1,s}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_{s-1})\Big),G_s(\Gamma_s)\rangle_{L^\infty(\Omega_s)} \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, we see

$$[B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_0}(\mathop{\times}_{t\in T}\{x_t\})](\rho_0) = \lim_{\Xi_t\to x_t \ (t\in T)}\frac{\Big(F_s(\Xi_s)\Phi^{s,s+1}\widehat{F}_{s+1}(\times^n_{t=s+1}\Xi_t)\Big)\times\Big(\Phi^{s-1,s}_*\widetilde{\rho}_{s-1})\Big)}{\int_{\Omega_0}[\widehat{F}_0(\times^n_{t=0}\Xi_t)](\omega_0)\ \ \rho_0(\omega_0)d\omega_0} \qquad (12)$$

3.3 The calculation of $\rho_s = \Phi^{s-1,s}_*(\widetilde{\rho}_{s-1})$ in (12)

Lemma 1. *It holds that*

(J$_1$) $\int^\infty_{-\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}A}\exp[-\frac{(x-By)^2}{2A^2}]\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}C}\exp[-\frac{(y-D)^2}{2C^2}]dy = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{A^2+B^2C^2}}\exp[-\frac{(x-BD)^2}{2(A^2+B^2C^2)}]$

(J$_2$) $\exp[-\frac{(A\omega-B)^2}{2E^2}]\exp[-\frac{(C\omega-D)^2}{2F^2}] \approx \exp[-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{A^2F^2+C^2E^2}{E^2F^2})\Big(\omega-\frac{(ABF^2+CDE^2)}{(A^2F^2+C^2E^2)}\Big)^2]$

where the notation "$\approx$" means as follows:

$$"f(\omega)\approx g(\omega)" \Longleftrightarrow "\text{there exists a positive } K \text{ such that } f(\omega) = Kg(\omega)\ \ (\forall\omega\in\Omega)"$$

The proof is elementary, and thus, it is omitted.

We see, by (6) and (I), that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\rho}_0(\omega_0) =& \lim_{\Xi_0\to x_0}\frac{F(\Xi_0)\rho_0}{\int_{\mathbb{R}}F(\Xi_0)\rho_0 d\omega_0}\\ \approx& \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}q_0}\exp[-\frac{(x_0-c_0\omega_0-d_0)^2}{2q_0^2}]\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_0}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_0-\mu_0)^2}{2\sigma_0^2}]\\ \approx& \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widetilde{\sigma}_0}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_0-\widetilde{\mu}_0)^2}{2\widetilde{\sigma}_0^2}]\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where

$$\widetilde{\sigma}_0^2=\frac{q_0^2\sigma_0^2}{q_0^2+c_0^2\sigma_0^2},\quad \widetilde{\mu}_0=\mu_0+\widetilde{\sigma}_0^2(\frac{c_0}{q_0^2})(x_0-d_0-c_0\mu_0) \tag{14}$$

Further, the (J_1) in Lemma 1 and (9) imply that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_1(\omega_1) =& [\Phi_*^{0,1}\widetilde{\rho}_0](\omega_1)\\ =& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}r_1}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_1-a_1\omega_0-b_1)^2}{2r_1^2}]\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widetilde{\sigma}_0}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_0-\widetilde{\mu}_0)^2}{2\widetilde{\sigma}_0^2}]d\omega_0\\ =& \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_1}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_1-\mu_1)^2}{2{\sigma_1}^2}]\end{aligned} \tag{15}$$

where

$$\sigma_1^2=\ a_1^2\widetilde{\sigma}_0^2+r_1^2,\quad \mu_1=a_1\widetilde{\mu}_0+b_1 \tag{16}$$

Thus, we see, by (J_2) in Lemma 1, that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\rho}_{t-1}(\omega_{t-1}) =& \lim_{\Xi_{t-1}\to x_{t-1}}\frac{F(\Xi_{t-1})\rho_{t-1}}{\int_{\mathbb{R}}F(\Xi_{t-1})\rho_{t-1}d\omega_{t-1}}\\ \approx& \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}q_{t-1}}\exp[-\frac{(x_{t-1}-c_{t-1}\omega_{t-1}-d_{t-1})^2}{2q_{t-1}^2}]\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{t-1}}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_{t-1}-\mu_{t-1})^2}{2\sigma_{t-1}^2}]\\ \approx& \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widetilde{\sigma}_{t-1}}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_{t-1}-\widetilde{\mu}_{t-1})^2}{2\widetilde{\sigma}_{t-1}^2}]\end{aligned} \tag{17}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{\sigma}_{t-1}^2 =& \frac{q_{t-1}^2\sigma_{t-1}^2}{q_{t-1}^2+c_{t-1}^2\sigma_{t-1}^2}=\sigma_{t-1}^2\frac{q_{t-1}^2+c_{t-1}^2\sigma_{t-1}^2+q_{t-1}^2-q_{t-1}^2-c_{t-1}^2\sigma_{t-1}^2}{q_{t-1}^2+c_{t-1}^2\sigma_{t-1}^2}\\ =& \sigma_{t-1}^2(1-\frac{c_{t-1}^2\sigma_{t-1}^2}{q_{t-1}^2+c_{t-1}^2\sigma_{t-1}^2})\\ \widetilde{\mu}_{t-1} =& \mu_{t-1}+\widetilde{\sigma}_{t-1}^2(\frac{c_{t-1}}{q_{t-1}^2})(x_{t-1}-c_{t-1}\mu_{t-1})\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Further, we see, by (J_1) in Lemma 1, that

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_t(\omega_t) =& [\Phi_*^{t-1,t}\widetilde{\rho}_{t-1}](\omega_t)\\ \approx& \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}r_t}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_t-a_t\omega_{t-1}-b_t)^2}{2r_t^2}]\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\widetilde{\sigma}_{t-1}}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_{t-1}-\widetilde{\mu}_{t-1})^2}{2\widetilde{\sigma}_{t-1}^2}]d\omega_{t-1}\\ \approx& \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_t}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_t-\mu_t)^2}{2{\sigma_t}^2}]\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where

$$\sigma_t^2 = a_t^2\widetilde{\sigma}_{t-1}^2 + r_t^2, \quad \mu_t = a_t\widetilde{\mu}_{t-1} + b_t \tag{20}$$

Summing up the above (13)–(20), we see:

$$\underset{\mu_0,\sigma_0}{\boxed{\rho_0}} \xrightarrow[(14)]{x_0} \underset{\widetilde{\mu}_0,\widetilde{\sigma}_0}{\boxed{\widetilde{\rho}_0}} \xrightarrow[(16)]{\Phi_*^{0,1}} \underset{\mu_1,\sigma_1}{\boxed{\rho_1}} \xrightarrow{x_1} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Phi_*^{t-2,t-1}} \underset{\mu_{t-1},\sigma_{t-1}}{\boxed{\rho_{t-1}}} \xrightarrow[(18)]{x_{t-1}} \underset{\widetilde{\mu}_{t-1},\widetilde{\sigma}_{t-1}}{\boxed{\widetilde{\rho}_{t-1}}} \xrightarrow[(20)]{\Phi_*^{t-1,t}} \underset{\mu_t,\sigma_t}{\boxed{\rho_t}} \xrightarrow{x_{t+1}} \cdots \xrightarrow{\Phi_*^{s-1,s}} \underset{\mu_s,\sigma_s}{\boxed{\rho_s}}$$

And thus, we get

$$\rho_s = \Phi_*^{s-1,s}(\widetilde{\rho}_{s-1}) \tag{21}$$

in (12).

3.4 The calculation of $\Big(F_s(\Xi_s)\Phi^{s,s+1}\widehat{F}_{s+1}(\times_{t=s+1}^{n}\Xi_t)\Big)$ in (12)

Put

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{f}_{x_n}(\omega_n) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}q_n}\exp[-\frac{(x_n - c_n\omega_n - d_n)^2}{2q_n^2}] \\ &\approx \exp[-\frac{(c_n\omega_n - (x_n - d_n))^2}{2q_n^2}] \equiv \exp[-\frac{1}{2}\Big(\widetilde{u}_n\omega_n - \widetilde{v}_n\Big)^2]\end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

where it is assumed that c_n, d_n and q_n are known ($t \in T$). And thus, put

$$\widetilde{u}_n = \frac{c_n}{q_n}, \quad \widetilde{v}_n = \frac{x_n - d_n}{q_n} \tag{23}$$

And further, Lemma 1 implies that the causal operator $\Phi^{t-1.t} : L^\infty(\Omega_t) \to L^\infty(\Omega_{t-1})$ is defined by

$$\begin{aligned}&f_{t-1}(\omega_{t-1}) = [\Phi^{t-1,t}\widetilde{f}_{x_t}](\omega_{t-1}) \\ &\approx \int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}r_t}\exp[-\frac{(\omega_t - a_t\omega_{t-1} - b_t)^2}{2r_t^2}]\exp[-\frac{(\widetilde{u}_t\omega_t - \widetilde{v}_t)^2}{2}]d\omega_t \\ &\approx \exp[-\frac{1}{2}\Big(\frac{\widetilde{v}_t}{\sqrt{1 + r_t^2\widetilde{u}_t^2}} - \frac{\widetilde{u}_t(a_t\omega_{t-1} + b_t)}{\sqrt{1 + r_t^2\widetilde{u}_t^2}}\Big)^2] \approx \exp[-\frac{1}{2}\Big(u_{t-1}\omega_{t-1} - v_{t-1}\Big)^2]\end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

where

$$u_{t-1} = -\frac{a_t\widetilde{u}_t}{\sqrt{1 + r_t^2\widetilde{u}_t^2}}, \quad v_{t-1} = \frac{b_t\widetilde{u}_t - \widetilde{v}_t}{\sqrt{1 + r_t^2\widetilde{u}_t^2}} \tag{25}$$

And also, Lemma 1 implies that

$$\begin{aligned}\widetilde{f}_{x_{t-1}}(\omega_{t-1}) &= \exp[-\frac{(c_{t-1}\omega_{t-1} + d_{t-1} - x_{t-1})^2}{2q_{t-1}^2}]\exp[-\frac{(u_{t-1}\omega_{t-1} - v_{t-1})^2}{2}] \\ &\approx \exp[-\frac{1}{2}(\frac{c_{t-1}^2 + u_{t-1}^2q_{t-1}^2}{q_{t-1}^2})\Big(\omega_{t-1} - \frac{c_{t-1}(d_{t-1} - t_{t-1}) + u_{t-1}v_{t-1}q_{t-1}^2}{c_{t-1}^2 + u_{t-1}^2q_{t-1}^2}\Big)^2] \\ &\approx \exp[-\frac{1}{2}\Big(\widetilde{u}_{t-1}\omega_{t-1} - \widetilde{v}_{t-1}\Big)^2]\end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

where

$$\widetilde{u}_{t-1} = \frac{\sqrt{c_{t-1}^2 + u_{t-1}^2q_{t-1}^2}}{q_{t-1}}, \quad \widetilde{v}_{t-1} = \frac{c_{t-1}(d_{t-1} - t_{t-1}) + u_{t-1}v_{t-1}q_{t-1}^2}{q_{t-1}\sqrt{c_{t-1}^2 + u_{t-1}^2q_{t-1}^2}} \tag{27}$$

Summing up the above (22)-(27), we see:

$$\boxed{\widetilde{f}_{x_s}}^{\widetilde{u}_s,\widetilde{v}_s}_{\widetilde{w}_s} \xleftarrow{x_s} \cdots \xleftarrow{\Phi^{t-2,t-1}} \boxed{\widetilde{f}_{x_{t-1}}}^{\widetilde{u}_{t-1},\widetilde{v}_{t-1}}_{\widetilde{w}_{t-1}} \xleftarrow[(27)]{x_{t-1}} \boxed{f_{t-1}}^{u_{t-1},v_{t-1}}_{w_{t-1}} \xleftarrow[(25)]{\Phi^{t-1,t}} \boxed{\widetilde{f}_{x_t}}^{\widetilde{u}_t,\widetilde{v}_t}_{\widetilde{w}_t} \xleftarrow{x_t} \cdots \xleftarrow{x_{n-1}} \boxed{f_{n-1}}^{u_{n-1},v_{n-1}}_{w_{n-1}} \xleftarrow{\Phi^{n-1,n}} \boxed{\widetilde{f}_{x_n}=(23)}^{\widetilde{u}_n\widetilde{v}_n}_{\widetilde{w}_n}$$

And thus, we get

$$\widetilde{f}_{x_s} \approx \lim_{\Xi_t \to x_t \ (t\in\{s.s+1,\cdots,n\})} \frac{\Big(F_s(\Xi_s)\Phi^{s,s+1}\widehat{F}_{s+1}(\times_{t=s+1}^{n}\Xi_t)\Big)}{\|F_s(\Xi_s)\Phi^{s,s+1}\widehat{F}_{s+1}(\times_{t=s+1}^{n}\Xi_t)\Big)\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_s)}} \tag{28}$$

in (12)

After all, we solve the problem (H), that is,

(H′) Assume that a measured value $(x_0, x_2, \cdots, x_n)$ $(\in \times_{t=0}^{n} X_t)$ is obtained by the measurement $\mathsf{M}_{L^\infty(\Omega_0)}$ $(\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_{t_0}, S_{[*]}(\rho_0))$. Let $s(\in T)$ be fixed. Then, we get the Bayes-Kalman operator $[B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_{t_0}}(\times_{t\in T}\{x_t\})](\rho_0)$, that is,

$$\Big([B^s_{\widehat{\mathsf{O}}_{t_0}}(\underset{t\in T}{\times}\{x_t\})]\rho_0\Big)(\omega_s) = \frac{\widetilde{f}_{x_s}(\omega_s)\cdot\rho_s(\omega_s)}{\int_{-\infty}^{\infty}\widetilde{f}_{x_s}(\omega_s)\cdot\rho_s(\omega_s)d\omega_s} \quad (\forall\omega_s\in\Omega_s)$$

where ρ_s in (21) and $\widetilde{f}_{x_s}$ in (28) can be iteratively calculated as mentioned in this section.

Remark 2. The following clssification is usual

(K_1) Smoothing: in the case that $0 \le s < n$

(K_2) Filter: in the case that $s = n$

(K_3) Prediction: in the case that $s = n$ and, for any m such that $n_0 \le m < n$, the observable $(X_m, \mathcal{F}_m, F_m) = (\{1\}, \{\emptyset, \{1\}\}, F_m)$ is defined by $F_m(\emptyset) \equiv 0$, $F_m(\{1\}) \equiv 1$,

4 Conclusions

We conclude as follows.

(L) Mathematically, quantum language may be somewhat more difficult than usual statistics. In fact, quantum language can not be understood without the knowledge of functional analysis. However, we think that the calculation of Kamlan filter is more understandable in terms of quantum language than in terms of usual statistics. Therefore we believe that quantum language is future statistics, i.e., statistics will develop into quantum language.

We hope that our proposal will be discussed and examined from various view-points.

References

[1] E. B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems,* Academic Press, 1976

[2] Isaac, R. *The pleasures of probability,* Springer-Verlag (Undergraduate texts in mathematics) 1995

[3] S. Ishikawa, *A Quantum Mechanical Approach to Fuzzy Theory,* Fuzzy Sets and Systems, Vol. 90, No. 3, 277-306, 1997
doi: 10.1016/S0165-0114(96)00114-5

[4] S. Ishikawa, *Statistics in measurements*, Fuzzy sets and systems, Vol. 116, No. 2, 141-154, 2000
doi:10.1016/S0165-0114(98)00280-2

[5] S. Ishikawa, *The existence theorem of Kalman filter in measurement theory*, Far East J. Dynamical Systems, Vol. 3, No. 2, 175-204, 2001

[6] S. Ishikawa, *Mathematical Foundations of Measurement Theory,* Keio University Press Inc. 335pages, 2006.
(http://www.keio-up.co.jp/kup/mfomt/)

[7] S. Ishikawa, *A New Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics,* Journal of quantum information science, Vol. 1, No. 2, 35-42, 2011
doi: 10.4236/jqis.2011.12005
(http://www.scirp.org/journal/PaperInformation.aspx?paperID=7610)

[8] S. Ishikawa, *Quantum Mechanics and the Philosophy of Language: Reconsideration of traditional philosophies,* Journal of quantum information science, Vol. 2, No. 1, 2-9, 2012
doi: 10.4236/jqis.2012.21002
(http://www.scirp.org/journal/PaperInformation.aspx?paperID=18194)

[9] S. Ishikawa, *A Measurement Theoretical Foundation of Statistics,* Applied Mathematics, Vol. 3, No. 3, 283-292, 2012
doi: 10.4236/am.2012.33044
(http://www.scirp.org/journal/PaperInformation.aspx?paperID=18109&)

[10] S. Ishikawa, "Monty Hall Problem and the Principle of Equal Probability in Measurement Theory," *Applied Mathematics*, Vol. 3, No. 7, 2012,pp. 788-794
doi: : 10.4236/am.2012.37117
(http://www.scirp.org/journal/PaperInformation.aspx?paperID=19884)

[11] S. Ishikawa, *Measurement theory in the philosophy of science,* arXiv:1209.3483 [physics.hist-ph] 2012.
(http://arxiv.org/abs/1209.3483)

[12] S. Ishikawa, *A quantum linguistic characterization of the reverse relation between confidence interval and hypothesis testing,* arXiv:1401.2709v2 [math.ST] 2014.
(http://arxiv-web3.library.cornell.edu/abs/1401.2709v2)

[13] S. Ishikawa, *ANOVA (analysis of variance) in the quantum lingustic formulation of statistics,* arXiv:1402.0606v1 [math.ST] 2014.
(http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.0606v1)

[14] S. Ishikawa, *Regression analysis in quantum language,* arXiv:1403.0060 [math.ST] 2014.
(http://arxiv.org/abs/1403.0060)

[15] Kikuchi, K. and Ishikawa, S. *Regression analysis, Kalman filter and measurement error model in measurement theory,* Research report, KSTS/RR-06/005 (Department of mathematics, Keio University) , (2006)
(http://www.math.keio.ac.jp/library/research/report/2006/06005.pdf#search='Research+repor++kikuchi+ishikawa')

[16] Kalman, R. E. *A new approach to linear filtering and prediction problems,* Trans. ASME, J. Basic Eng. **82**, 35 (1960)

[17] A. Kolmogorov, *Foundations of probability* (*translation*)*C* Chelsea Publishing Co. 1950

[18] J. von Neumann, *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics,* Springer Verlag, Berlin, 1932

[19] S. Sakai, C^**-algebras and* W^**-algebras*, Ergebnisse der Mathematik und ihrer Grenzgebiete (Band 60), Springer-Verlag, (1971)

[20] K. Yosida, *Functional Analysis,* Springer-Verlag, 6th edition, 1980.